Application No. Applicant(s) 10/693.015 PHILLIPS ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit TAMMIE HELLER 3766 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) TAMMIE HELLER. (4)____. (2) Attorney Jessica Kwak. Date of Interview: 17 September 2008. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)XI No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Stanton in view of Maeda. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The amendment filed on September 4, 2008 was determined to overcome the anticipated rejections under 102. However, the obviousness rejection under 103(a) as being obvious over Stanton in view of Maeda stands. The Examiner indicated that the claim amendment would put the claims in better condition for allowance, however further consideration of the prior art or record would be necessary to determine the patentability of the claims.. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.